COVER SHEET

A Queer New World: Adaptation Theory and the Zeugma of Fidelity in Derek Jarman's *The Tempest.*

By D. Bruno Starrs. Queensland University of Technology.

Keywords.
Shakespeare, Derek Jarman, adaptation theory.

Abstract.
In this paper it is argued the negative reception by American practitioners of fidelity criticism received by Derek Jarman's film *The Tempest* (1979) was unwarranted when viewed in light of later developments in adaptation theory. Jarman's aim was to show that a queer lifestyle is preferable to the strictly faithful, heterosexual lifestyle expected in marriage, rather than to make yet another faithful adaptation of Shakespeare's play for the screen. The director's characterization of Caliban and Ariel served as an allegory for Prospero's queer desire in Jarman's very subversive, controversial reading and was fore-grounded to the extent the film could be described as either an 'analogous adaptation', a 'borrowing', a 'deconstruction', a 'parody' or even a 'new work of art', according to the various adaptation theorists. For Britons, less awed by Shakespeare than outsiders to British culture such as Jarman's contemporaries in the United States of America, such infidelity to the original, like the inevitable infidelity associated with heterosexual marriage, may be acceptable and even desirable.

Despite being well received by British cinema critics, Derek Jarman's 1979 UK film *The Tempest* failed to find critical acclaim in the United States of America. Shocked responses to the flagrant sexuality in the movie were to be expected but much of the scorn was due to the film's alleged unfaithfulness to Shakespeare's play - so called 'fidelity criticism' - and included reviews such as Vincent Canby's in the *New York Times*, which described the film as "very nearly unbearable" and "You can barely see through the production to Shakespeare, so you must rely on memory" (20). Jarman ruefully noted that most American reviewers "saw it as deliberately willful, and the *New York Times* mounted an attack which destroyed it in the cinemas there" (Jarman, 1984, 206). Defending himself against such derision, Jarman opined that in America "messing with Will Shakespeare is not allowed", adding that "in such a fragmented culture […t]he Anglo-Saxon tradition had to be defended" (Jarman, 1984, 206). Described as "The ultimate British queer filmmaker" (McFarlane 343), Jarman was an artist whose oeuvre was typified by *The Tempest*, in that much of his output promoted queer lifestyles. Jim Leach said "The raw energy of Jarman's work testifies to his personal investment in films that often scandalized critics by their graphic representation of gay sexuality" (Leach 82). In further defense of his version of *The Tempest*, Jarman also exclaimed " 'It was Shakespeare's *Salo*', a reference to the notorious Pasolini film adaptation of the Marquis de Sade's *120 Days of Sodom.*" (Wymer 74). Certainly, Jarman's interpretation of Shakespeare's play is not traditional: much of the original text is excised and the surviving lines and scenes are so significantly rearranged as to "remak[e]" the text into "a commentary on the 1970s counterculture movement" in Britain, "intended for punk and gay audiences" (Vaughan and Vaughan 200, 209). Such a foreign culture was a queer new world to many Americans: little wonder then that some of those cinema goers would describe it as unfaithful.

Faith, sir, you need not fear.

The terms 'faithfulness' and 'fidelity' are not only rife to the extent of being almost unavoidable in movie reviews of screen adaptations but in academic circles too, as Robert Giddings and Erica Sheen observed in 2000: "[…] the central critical category of adaptation studies [is] the notion of 'fidelity', or 'faithfulness to the text'" (2). Dudley Andrew had previously noted, with some dissatisfaction, the ubiquity of the term: "Unquestionably the most frequent and most tiresome discussion of adaptation (and of film and literature relations as well) concerns fidelity" (100). Indeed, many commentators, be they reviewer or academic, will eschew the adaptation they feel is, through its subjectively perceived infidelity, disrespectful to the source. André Bazin acknowledged this rather modern notion, arising in the nineteenth century, of the "untouchability of a work of art" (22). Bazin noted that since the development of legal definitions such as 'author' and 'copyright', before which the work of art was an end in itself and more important than the identity of the creator of the content or the work's message, there has been snobbish opposition to the adaptation of 'pure' or 'classic' works of art, especially when they are thence made more accessible, as in cinema, to the masses. Perhaps because of this elitism towards 'straight' Shakespeare or perhaps because fidelity criticism is what Patrice Pavis called "a cliché of critical discourse" (26), fidelity in screen adaptations will always be a criterion resistant to anything like scientific quantification. Indeed, it is so imprecise a term the argument can easily be made to do away with it entirely for those screen adaptations that have set out to be entirely new creations, inspired by but not the same as a pre-existing source. And just as defenders of heterosexual mores have difficulty accepting the rights of the queer, Derek

Jarman's *The Tempest*, which arguably promotes queerness, may in itself be an example of a screen adaptation that resists acceptance.

Unfortunately for ardent practitioners of the nascent discipline of adaptation studies, as Andrew argued, a perfectly faithful screen adaptation is "frankly impossible […because] it involves the systematic replacement of verbal signifiers by cinematic signifiers" (101). There are no means by which exact equivalence between the two completely different medium's languages can be achieved. One of the first to address this problematic issue was Nelson Goodman who in 1976 suggested looking not at the exact equivalence of elements but rather at the relative position elements occupy in their respective domains (143-8). Andrew clarified Goodman's theory with the following example: "We can and do correctly match items from different systems all the time: a tuba sound is more like a rock than a piece of string; it is more like a bear than a bird; more like a Romanesque church than a Baroque one" (102). The viewer must, either consciously or sub-consciously, negotiate the non-equivalent signs. He must undertake a personal and very individual reading process, wherein his previous exposure in the same medium to accepted uses and meanings of the sign in question pre-condition him to the desired understanding presented by the director of the new adaptation. The general failing of adaptation theory, then, is that there is no universal dictionary for decoding. No system exists relating different medium, and, due to the fluidity of signs and their meanings, can perhaps never even be hoped for. An adaptor must simply assume that his viewer is an experienced consumer of signs in the relevant medium and 'reads' his adaptation from a similar position of experience to himself. Nevertheless, there have been attempts to theorize and create hierarchies of fidelity in screen adaptations of literary works.

The first comprehensive attempt to definitively categorize screen adaptations of novels was by cinema academic Geoffrey Wagner in 1975. "The three modes of adaptation" (Wagner 223) he described consisted of:

> 1. Transposition. This type of adaptation is the most faithful rendition of the original in cinematic form possible. The adaptors simply view the end result as an illustration of the source, often including explicit reference to the source's medium. With novels, such an approach is exemplified by films that have an opening shot of the original book being opened by a partially pictured actor as book reader, followed by a shot lingering expositionally on the title-page, before the page is turned by the reader to reveal an illustration 'coming to life' as the action of the movie commences.
> 2. Commentary. Wagner said: "This is where an original is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect. It could also be called a re-emphasis or re-structure" (226). Locations, chronological periods and even endings may be changed and the adaptor manages to create something quite different, yet nevertheless similar to the original document.
> 3. Analogy. Wagner almost considered changes in chronological period, say from Shakespeare's Elizabethan times to modern day, as an example of analogous adaptation, but concluded: "For our purposes here analogy must represent a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art [… it] cannot be indicted as a violation of a literary original since the director has not attempted (or has only minimally attempted) to reproduce the original." (227). In the analogous adaptation the new work of art is substantially different and may not even be

initially understood by an audience as having anything to do with its source. Rarely will the analogous adaptation beggar confusion with more faithful adaptations by retaining the original's title.

Since Wagner, there have been several more or less comprehensive attempts to categorize screen adaptations. In 1981 Michael Klein and Gillian Parker worked along similar lines to Wagner and proposed that the different adaptation types could be described as, firstly, "literal translations", which stay as close to the original as possible; secondly, "re-interpretations" of the source text which retain its core; and thirdly, entirely "new works of art" which take the source text merely as a point of departure (Klein and Parker 9-10).

Then in a brief discussion on the matter in 1984 the previously mentioned Dudley Andrew also described three modes. He called the most frequent of adaptations "borrowing", in which the "material, idea or form of an earlier, generally successful, text" (Andrew 98) is employed by the adaptor. Its rarest opposite is the "intersecting" adaptation which "present[s] the otherness and distinctiveness of the original text" (100). According to Andrew, the intersecting adaptation, "intentionally left unassimilated in adaptation" (99), is exemplified by Robert Bresson's film *Diary of a Country Priest (Le Journal d'un cure de campagne)* (1951), which Andre Bazin also favorably cites due to director Bresson actually featuring vision of the writing of the diary and because it "attend[s] to the specificity of the original within the specificity of the cinema" (100). Finally for Andrew is the most common mode of adaptation he called "transformation" in which something "essential" about the original is reproduced with the aim of measuring up to the literary work (100). Fidelity to the original is treated in relation to the 'letter' of a text; its characters and their inter-relations, its narrative aspects such as tense and point of view, and the more difficult 'spirit' of a text; the original's tone, imagery, rhythm etc.

Following Andrew, in their quite relevant 1991 study of stage and screen adaptations of *The Tempest*, Alden Vaughan and Virginia Vaughan also described three modes: "interpretation" or "a general adherence to Shakespeare's original"; "appropriation" or the application of the play to "a present cultural dilemma"; and "adaptations" or "borrowings that owe much to the spirit or characters of Shakespeare's play but very little to its text" (Vaughan and Vaughan xxi). Where Jarman's *The Tempest* lay in their hierarchy was unfortunately not discussed in detail.

In 1996 Brian McFarlane proposed "literal or spiritual fidelity" to the original, a "commentary" which would present some kind of "departure" from the source text, and the quite fashionable term "deconstruction" which "bring[s] to light the internal contradictions in seemingly coherent systems of thought in the source text" (McFarlane 22).

A more recent addition to the terminology of adaptation studies was the category named 'parody'. In 2002 Linda Burnett cited Linda Hutcheon who suggested that "writers in places like Ireland and Canada, working as they do from both inside and outside a culturally different and dominant context" (Hutcheon 167) are especially attracted to writing what Burnett calls 'parodies' which; "[…] cannot help but entail acts of appropriation and subversion [but are] also respectful, functioning both to pay tribute to and to sabotage Shakespeare. And this double voice marks its resemblance to parody, which also asks searching questions of even as it pays homage to earlier works." (Burnett 5) The typical parody will "attempt to amplify what is muted in Shakespeare" (8) and can "be understood as the post-modern manifestation of the parodic strategy" (6). Burnett further clarifies the affectionate nature of these parodic adaptations written from within the Commonwealth when she said; "Whereas

postmodernism uses irony simply to tear down, post colonialism uses it both to dissemble and to reassemble […] It goes beyond the deconstruction of the texts that make up our cultural history to create new texts in which the old stories are re-imagined and reinterpreted from formerly precluded perspectives." (6). The goal of the respectful parody is "not to vanquish the stories that have been told […] Rather, it is to advance narratives to stand beside (in addition to) earlier narratives […] to counterbalance those earlier univocal narratives" (7). Could Jarman's *The Tempest* be a parody of Shakespeare's play? Harris and Jackson identify the flashback scenes as having a "hint of parody" (93), but the overall sense of sabotaging and satirizing Shakespeare's narrative is missing. Rather, it can be argued that Jarman invented an entirely new narrative with his creation of a bi-erotic universe within Prospero's figurative island. Although tempting, I would suggest that Jarman's creativity and inventiveness goes far beyond a respectful parody that nevertheless pays homage to the original. Whilst a sense of disrespect for the original may linger on the taste buds of the viewer, one can not fail to acknowledge that this *Tempest* is Jarman. Indeed, the director appears as an extra in much of his work, stamping his ownership of the artwork in Hitchcockian fashion. "It is true that Jarman sometimes appears in his own films in order to frame his singular vision." (Orr 329).

Why then did he not rename his work? It can be argued that Jarman's adherence to the title of the Shakespearean original allowed him to work more effectively on his inventive reading of the film's queer politics, a reading which permits an understanding of his version of *The Tempest* as an utterly subversive one; one that perverts without due respect. Indeed, by calling his film *The Tempest* in such close reference to the original, Jarman may have been insisting on his film being viewed as both a stormy proposal for a radical revision of the play's content and even, too, as a claim to his work being on par with the Bard's original. In another medium, one of Jarman's celebrated paintings shows copies of British tabloid newspaper *The Sun's* front page banner headline "VILE BOOK IN SCHOOL. Pupils see pictures of gay lovers" with the following words scratched over it;

> "Copies sent to the Arts Minister
> Dear William Shakespeare
> I am a 14 year old and I'm
> Queer like you I'm learning
> Art I want to be a queer artist
> Like Leonardo or Michelangelo
> But I like Francis Bacon best […]" (Letter to the Minister, 1992).

Such an arrogant stance for an artist to take! Certainly one not to be condoned by the likes of Vincent Canby, who probably felt duty-bound to defend the Anglo-Saxon tradition as exemplified by the works of Shakespeare.

It was possibly this wish to make the film distinctively his own, yet on par with Shakespeare, in combination with his undeniable love for the original (Jarman spoke of the joy he found in "the delicate description in the poetry, full of sound and sweet airs" (Jarman, 1984, 186)) that made for a vibrant, highly politicized and self-indulgent new screen creation, but that nevertheless can be interpreted as an unfaithful act of some disrespect. Fidelity to Shakespeare's original was perhaps seen by Jarman as irrelevant and doomed a concept as vows of fidelity are in heterosexual matrimony; the very subject material he highlighted in this film.

In general summary, and returning to the adaptation theorists, the most faithful adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* - according to Wagner, Klein and Parker, Andrew, the two Vaughans and Burnett respectively - would be a transpositional

adaptation, a literal/spiritual translation, an intersecting adaptation, an interpretative adaptation and/or a homage-like parody. The least faithful would be an analogous adaptation, a new work of art, an appropriation and/or a deconstruction. Although there might be doubt as to the exact label to apply, to this writer Jarman's film undoubtedly falls into the latter grouping.

O queer new world that has such people in't.

Many of Shakespeare's plays include cross-dressing and, by inference, bisexuality; *Twelfth Night, Much Ado About Nothing* and *The Merchant of Venice* spring instantly to mind. But not *The Tempest*. Yet, within the Shakespearean post-modern cinematic tradition, screen versions of *The Tempest* seem to occupy a special place due to their imaginative interpretations: inventive versions on film range from Fred Wilcox's *The Forbidden Planet* (1956) to Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books* (1991). Vaughan and Vaughan attribute this variety to *The Tempest* being "one of Shakespeare's most unrealistic plays" (Vaughan and Vaughan 200). They did not, however, consider Jarman's version that which they would technically label an adaptation, noting that he cut most of the original text, and drastically rearranged the remaining lines and scene order so as to make a commentary (209). Confusingly, by using the word 'commentary' they seem to have avoided the distinctions posited in their own theoretical framework and one is left to wonder if Jarman's *The Tempest* is, according to the Vaughan and Vaughan model, an 'appropriation' because of its re-interpretation in terms of contemporary cultural conflict, that is, an uneasy fit of British punk and queer culture into the play's plot, or, because of its excision of so much of Shakespeare's text, a 'borrowing'? Rather than using Wagner's or McFarlane's categorization of 'commentary', they distractingly apply the term sociologically in the sense of the adaptation being a commentary on British 70s counterculture more than a commentary on the original play. Or did Vaughan and Vaughan ultimately interpret Jarman's creation as an adaptational 'borrowing' due to its remarkable divergence from the source text and its blatant queer political agenda? As it is, their analysis of Jarman's *The Tempest* rests uncomfortably between these two distinctions. This labeling confusion is not missing either from an application of Klein and Parker's model to Jarman's *The Tempest* and one is left wondering if they would have called it a 're-interpretation' or a 'new work of art'? Ultimately, one is left wondering at the value of any of these labels.

Given Jarman's strong connection with the British counterculture of the 70s and 80s as a proud and openly queer man, the next relevant question therefore is to what extent and to what ends Jarman's *The Tempest* ignores the original Shakespearean *fabula* to create an entirely new piece rather than an adaptation of Shakespeare's play. How much of the film's universe is reminiscent of Shakespeare's, and how much introduces a different and entirely newer world that is uniquely Jarman's and unimagined by Shakespeare? Kenneth Rothwell in 1999 called Jarman's *The Tempest*: "a post–modernist version" of the play, which, "by imposing a gay/camp vision" (Rothwell 207, 205) deconstructs Shakespeare's subject matter along the lines of gender preference. Jarman turned the film's finale, for example, into a surprising and invigorating queer comedy. The audience is suddenly thrown into an unmistakably queer world of bright colors, music and dancing that questions the heterosexual pairing concurrently underway in the wedding between Miranda and Ferdinand and the solemn vows of fidelity inherent to that ceremony. The promise of heterosexual fidelity in the marital vows appears unrealistic in the context of the tempting carnal delights Jarman surrounds the nuptials with. A merry "spoof of a Busby Berkeley production number"

(Rothwell 207) and a band of young male sailors dancing in pairs to an up-tempo hornpipe is staged with barely suppressed queer innuendo, while the uniformed Italian courtiers await their pleasures also, dozing and snoring: all representing a renaissance collection of potential 'Village People'. Jarman aptly rounds the outing off with a rendition of the blues song 'Stormy Weather', performed by the sultry black soul singer Elizabeth Welch. She wears "the sophisticated garb of a twenties' chanteuse" (Harris and Jackson 96) and "[s]ingle-handed[ly] ... replace[s] Iris, Ceres and Juno" (Jarman, 1984, 191) to outweigh heterosexual prejudice against queers. It is at the start of this camp ritual, with Trinculo as drag queen, that Miranda utters the prophetic: "Oh How beauteous mankind is | Oh brave new world that has such people in't!" (Jarman, 1979, 76th min). Significantly, Prospero's corrective response has been excised, which leaves Miranda's (and the audience's) full appreciation of the queer new world intact and paves the way for Jarman's personalized queer utopia. Rowland Wymer notes that "In a 1978 draft of the script, Jarman commented acerbically, 'Ferdinand and Miranda lived happily ever after (,) a state only attained by flowers and vegetables'." (79). Several commentators have identified this "stunning wedding-masque finale" (Harris and Jackson 95) as the epitome of the uniquely queer Jarmanian universe he created in his *The Tempest.*

My tricksy spirit, our revels now are unended.

Another of the more inventive changes that Jarman made to *The Tempest* play-script was to foreground an intimate, homo-erotic relationship between Prospero and Ariel (Ariel has, of course, been interpreted by many stage and screen directors as male and/or female). In 1997, Diana Harris and Jackson MacDonald claimed there was: "an element of psychodrama involving the central trinity of Prospero, Ariel and Caliban" (97) such that Caliban and Ariel could be seen as extensions of Prospero's psyche, representing antagonistic notions of rationality and irrationality, restraint and freedom, and hetero and homosexuality. Such a psychosexual reading, as John Collick said earlier in 1989, ties in with Jarman's representation of events as a kind of nightmarish dream, "plac[ing] the action entirely within the mind of Prospero" (Collick 99). The film's initial shots of Prospero restlessly tossing and turning on his bed in a dark Gothic mansion interspersed with the sounds and images of the shipwreck and cries such as the allegorical "We split" (Jarman, 1979, 3rd min) are remembered as the movie ends with Prospero peacefully asleep in the dark ballroom, his interior monologue echoing the play's lines: "Our revels now are ended … We are such stuff | As dreams are made on; and our little life | Is rounded with a sleep" (Shakespeare, 1996, 148-58). Together with the dark and gloomy yet timeless atmosphere of the film and actor Heathcote Williams' characterization as a young, vigorous, 'Byronic' Prospero sporting a "Beethoven"- like hairdo (Harris and Jackson 91), they are clear markers that Jarman intended the film to represent "an island of the mind" and an "abstract landscape" (Jarman, 1984, 186). That most of the action was shot in the dimly lit chambers and labyrinthine corridors of the Tudor-style Stoneleigh Abbey in Warwickshire or the indistinct and illusory blue-filtered sparse sand dunes of the exterior shots adds to the sensation of the film being a projection of Prospero's stormy mental processes.

Consequently, Jarman imbued Ariel's 'airy', spiritual character with an erotically charged physicality which served his overall reading of *The Tempest* as a queer pamphlet. Importantly, Harris and Jackson placed "the relationship between Prospero and Ariel […] at the emotional centre of the film" (97) and indeed, many of the key scenes in the film underline the homo-erotic tension present in their relationship. When Prospero first calls for Ariel the tone used is that of an impatient partner rather

than an overbearing master, and Ariel has him wait as if it were a game of hide-and-seek between (traditionally straight) flirting lovers (Jarman, 1979, 4th min). Prospero repeatedly promises freedom to Ariel in return for his loyal service, but the softness with which his words are spoken have a sexual undertone, thus hinting at the imminent release of queer desire. Again the promise of freedom is repeated and Ariel smugly turns his face for a camera close-up, panting heavily as if in "postcoital lassitude" (Harris and Jackson 95). Prospero is unwilling to release him and reminds Ariel of how he freed him from the spell of the witch Sycorax. Interestingly, the flashback of this scene is infused with heterophobic sentiment: an immense, pale, flabby and naked Sycorax has an equally nude but adult Caliban suckling on her breasts. She pulls on the chain around Ariel's neck to move his handsome naked body closer to also suckle but he manages to escape. Ariel is shown to be repulsed by the thought of hetero physical contact with the hideous woman, and the sight of full-grown Caliban breastfeeding only enhances this repulsion. Thus, Prospero's demand for loyalty is, in fact, a demand for the victory of handsome queerness over ugly heterosexual desire.

Nevertheless, Prospero's general attitude towards Ariel is one of friendship: whereas he cruelly steps on Caliban's fingers to punish him for heterosexual advances on Miranda, he praises Ariel with an admiring "[t]hy tricksy spirit" (Jarman, 1979, 4th min) for organizing the glamorous wedding ceremony that in reality is to be staged as a celebration of queerness, vaunted as it is in bright colors, music, drag and sweaty physicality and, which not surprisingly, represents one of the few moments when Jarman's *The Tempest* fully abandons its dismal air. If Ariel denotes Prospero's queer side, a 'tricksy', difficult-to-handle part of his own spirit, then Jarman's film can be read as an allegory of its necessary and healthy release. The wedding celebration can be seen as the cathartic celebration of Prospero's bisexuality and after Ariel has finally been released (symbolizing the release of homoerotic desire) he 'comes out of the closet', exchanging the mansion for the wide world. In the 'silence after the storm', Prospero is peacefully asleep and his voice-over proclaims that his 'revels' are over, here taken not only to mean the matrimonial rites, but also the queer pleasures experienced adjacent. With such a psychosexual reading, Jarman's *The Tempest* becomes propaganda against the repression of queer desire and represents yet another example of Jarman's "… campaigning tirelessly for queer (the word he came to prefer) causes" (Watson 33). Jarman successfully invited the viewer to revel in his queer universe at a time when queer liberation was still a relatively recent phenomenon in Britain.

This thing of darkness?

Vaughan and Vaughan's study of the stage and screen representations of the character Caliban determined he "is the most enigmatic and the most susceptible to drastic fluctuations in interpretation" and called him "Shakespeare's changeling" (Vaughan and Vaughan 7). What more appropriate term could there be for an actively queer person than 'changeling'? Indeed, Caliban's identity has always been the object of speculation - although usually racial - and Deborah Cartmell saw him endowed with the "stereotypes of savagery, cannibalism, lust and anarchy" although "not explicitly black", and drew attention to what she called his "surprisingly unproblematic" representation "in the latter half of [the twentieth] century", using Jarman's *The Tempest* as an example (Cartmell 78). Thanks to this elusiveness, Caliban was easily transformed into a prime exponent of Jarman's queer universe, whilst the director sidestepped the racial issue by casting a white actor in the role. The underplaying of race is enforced by the highly insurrectionary nude scene previously mentioned in which Caliban is suckling from his mother Sycorax's breast (Jarman, 1979, 56th min),

who is played by the frighteningly voluptuous white actress Claire Davenport. Nevertheless, Caliban's whiteness does not turn him into an a genteel New Worlder; Cartmell described him as a "non-threatening, old, decrepit, stupid and gay" outsider, whose humanity, however pathetic, can not be denied" (Cartmell 80). Interestingly, Jarman cast the mime actor Jack Birkett, "the perennial favorite of the Lindsey Kemp clique" (Rothwell 206) for the part, whose blindness, although going entirely unnoticed in the film, could be interpreted as symbolizing the vulnerability and lack of threat this queer Caliban poses.

In the Shakespearean play Caliban is contrasted with Ferdinand, who Miranda instantly admires as "a thing divine, for nothing natural | I ever saw so noble" (Shakespeare, Act I, ii., 418), whereas she rejects Caliban as "a villain … I do not love to look on" (Shakespeare, Act I, ii., 308-9). However, in Jarman's film the relationship has far less contrast and while Ferdinand and Miranda seem to be on more equal footing, both partaking in play and politics, Caliban's sexual interest in Miranda provokes different responses to those in the play. When Caliban scoffs a raw egg and opens his fly, she seems amused by the sexual allusion (Jarman, 1979, 7th min). The comment on his 'villainous' personality follows hard upon the latter scene, but here has more of an innocent child's opinion than actual loathing. Yet again, Caliban's occasional flirts turn into games of playful laughter for both, as when he intrudes on her while she is washing and then passes wind when she throws him out (Jarman, 1979, 18th min). These flirtations almost match the games Miranda and Ferdinand play later on and negate the differences the original text propounds between both men, making the queer 'monster' Caliban much more human.

Generally speaking, Jarman's vision of Caliban's role incorporates more of the innocent and harmless court jester than the dangerous "thing of darkness" (Shakespeare, Act V.1.275-6) that should be controlled by Prospero at all costs. As Rothwell described it, Jarman concentrated his efforts in "defang[ing the] heterosoc" prejudice against queers that he saw as the lynchpin for ideological, racist and gender policing (Rothwell 204). That he chose to underplay the racial element in Caliban had more to do with his desire to make a provocative statement on homo and bi-phobia than with a wish to address racial prejudice (cf. Cartmell, 80-1). Marjorie Garber asked if a queer Shakespeare fits no-one's erotic agenda (Garber 514-5) to which Jarman might have replied 'Watch my version of *The Tempest*'. That he was able to spearhead his pro-queer agenda at a time when racism was a prominent issue of serious political debate in Britain was a measure of his queer commitment and Caliban's acknowledged elusiveness. It is likely, therefore, that Jarman deliberately imbued Prospero's thing of darkness with yet another, relevant connotation in this queer universe (one should also note that Jarman nevertheless gave the racial issue a different, more positive bent by having the sexy black soul singer Elizabeth Welch head the film's climax).

Jarman's directorial interventions such as the removal of much of the dialogue; the rearrangement of the remaining text with subsequent new plot twists; the shuffling of costumes between different historical periods with obvious reference to queer and punk subcultures; the unusual casting choices including punk singer Toyah Wilcox as Miranda and 'Velazquez' dwarves as extras; the creation of a timeless dream-like structure; the choice of setting in a Gothic mansion rather than on an island; and the introduction of a startlingly camp universe as both point of departure and arrival, reconstructed the Shakespearean script into a film that is substantially different from the original play, yet nevertheless leaves a strange sensation of familiarity due to the fragmented use of Shakespeare's heightened language and well-known characters. In spite of this, Jarman's *The Tempest* may quite probably be called a 'deconstruction' in

McFarlane's terms, as it unearths the fault-lines in the unchallenged discourse on the prevalence and desirability of heterosexual love in the source text. But Jarman went further than 'unearthing fault-lines' by positively foregrounding queerness as an alternative to the doomed vows of heterosexual fidelity. And that little bit further took his work beyond, even, the other adaptation theorist's terms of 'analogous adaptation', 'borrowing' or 'parody'.

Let your indulgence set me free.

Attempts to measure screen adaptations in relation to their similarity with the source often result in problematic conclusions regarding their worth. Brian McFarlane concluded that: "fidelity [...] cannot profitably be used as an evaluative criterion; it can be no more than a descriptive term to designate loosely a certain kind of adaptation" (166). Given the limitations of fidelity criticism and the wide range of unhelpful labels suggested by theorists, one may be tempted to avoid such designations entirely. Indeed, such categorizations that seek to establish a hierarchy of faithfulness are inherently problematic regardless of the high esteem in which the original may be held. Certainly, with adaptations such as Jarman's *The Tempest*, which are quite possibly new works of art, fidelity criticism is irrelevant and unwarranted, even if the title may suggest otherwise. One cannot help but note that Jarman`s excisions, re-orderings, imaginative production design and editing created a sense of idiosyncrasy that was made explicit in the movie's promotion: "*The Tempest* … as seen through the eyes of Derek Jarman" (Crowl 1). It was not overtly promoted as 'William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*', and, if it qualifies as Wagner's 'analogous' adaptation, it certainly "cannot be indicted as a violation of a literary original since the director has not attempted (or has only minimally attempted) to reproduce the original" (Wagner 227). It might be more accurate to state that Jarman had replaced the original, an act tantamount to heresy in the eyes of an American culture in which Shakespeare is regarded with solemn awe.

In the aftermath of Jarman's untimely AIDS-related death, Harris and Jackson paid respect to *The Tempest*'s director by re-assessing the film with an in-depth analysis, choosing to read the film as his cinematic testimony and extrapolating onto Jarman a traditional understanding of Prospero as the impersonation of Shakespeare saying farewell to the stage (Harris and Jackson 97). *The Tempest* was Shakespeare's last play, written in 1611, only three years before his death. Evidently, the words on human mortality which Jarman gave to Prospero and moved conveniently to the film's epilogue, together with the notion of the film's queer universe as the product of Prospero's overactive mind, can be understood as providing this testimonial direction. Indeed, Jarman's *The Tempest* can be seen to be a response to the British punk and queer counterculture's unspoken plea to the director; "Let your indulgence set me free" (Shakespeare, epilogue). Thus, Jarman re-read, recreated and "messed" (Jarman, 1984, 206) with Shakespeare's play as a positive statement on queer politics, and his film now stands as a systematically anachronistic palimpsest that reads more as a new work of art than any other type of adaptation. Just as persons who enjoy queer sexual relations with either or the same gender confound those fundamentalists in either heterosexual camps who wish to neatly pigeonhole them, Jarman's *The Tempest* is a nuisance to practitioners of adaptation theory who fail to see it as an entirely new work of art. With *The Tempest*, Jarman has made clear his disrespect for the zeugma of fidelity, be it fidelity in heterosexual matrimony or fidelity in adaptation, and has done so with similar disregard for those Americans such as Vincent Canby who consider Shakespeare sacrosanct.

References.

Andrew, Dudley (1984), *Concepts in Film Theory*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bazin, André (2000), 'Adaptation, or the cinema as digest', in James Naremore (ed.), *Film Adaptation*, New Brunswick and New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Burnett, Linda (2002), " 'Redescribing a World': Towards a Theory of Shakespearean Adaptation in Canada", *Canadian Theatre Review*, 111, Summer.

Canby, Vincent (1980), 'Screen: The Tempest', *New York Times*, 22 September 1980.

Cartmell, Deborah (2000), *Interpreting Shakespeare on Screen*, London: MacMillan.

Collick, John (1989), *Shakespeare, Cinema and Society*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Crowl, Samuel (1980), 'Stormy weather: a new Tempest on film', *Shakespeare on Film Newsletter*, 5.1, 1.

Garber, Marjorie (1995). *Vice Versa: Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Giddings, Robert and Erica Sheen (2000), *The Classic Novel: From Page to Screen*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Goodman, Nelson (1976), *Languages of Art*, Indianopolis: Hacket.

Harris, Diana and MacDonald Jackson (1997), 'Stormy weather: Derek Jarman's "The Tempest"', *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 25, 2.

Hutcheon, Linda. "Circling the Downspout of Empire", *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-colonialism and Post-Modernism*, Adam, Ian and Helen Tiffen (eds.) Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990.

Jarman, Derek (1979), *The Tempest*, Kendon Films: UK.

Jarman, Derek (1984), *Dancing Ledge*, Shawn Allen (ed.), London: Quartet Books.

Leach, Jim (2004), *British Film*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, Michael and Gillian Parker (eds) (1981), *The English Novel and the Movie*, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing.

McFarlane, Brian (1996), *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McFarlane, Brian (2003). *The Encyclopedia of British Film*, London: Methuen.

Orr, John (2000). 'Art of National Identity: Peter Greenaway and Derek Jarman', in Ashby, Justine and Andrew Higson (eds.) *British Cinema, Past and Present*, London and NY: Routledge.

Pavis, Patrice (1992), *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, London: Routledge.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. (1999), *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shakespeare, William (1996), *The Tempest*, London: Penguin Books.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Virginia Mason Vaughan (1991), *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, Geoffrey (1975), *The Novel and the Cinema*, New Jersey: Associated University Presses Inc.

Watson, Gray (1996), 'An archaeology of soul' in Wollen, Roger (ed.) *Derek Jarman: A Portrait*, London: Thames and Hudson.

Wymer, Rowland (2005), *Derek Jarman*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.